

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are pending in this application, with claim 1 amended herein.

In the office action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,888,837 to Cunningham.

In the final office action, the Examiner suggests amendments which are asserted to overcome Cunningham, based on Fig. 7 of the instant application and providing explicit details of how the parameters are used. In response to this suggestion, claim 1 is amended herein to recite:

judging whether communication between the domains is permitted or not for the relay on the basis of said inter-domain communicability field which is held in said inter-domain communication definition module and defined for each combination of source domain identifier and destination domain identifier, in the case of a relay between the domains different from each other,

and

the relay control unit translates address information included in the communication data on the basis of said translation rule which is held in said inter-domain communication definition module and defined for each combination of source domain identifier and destination identifier, registers, in an address translation table, mapping information indicating a mapping of said address information before being translated to said address information after being translated, and relays the communication data between the domains different from each other on the basis of said mapping information registered in said address translation table.

Further details of the features added to independent claims 1 are shown in FIG. 4, FIG. 5 and the description of the figures (Page 26 line 3 – page 30 line 30 of the specification). Further the processing of communicability field and translation rule defined by said inter-

domain communication definition module (FIG. 7, page 21 lines 4-12 of the specification) are shown for example, at page 30 lines 1-24.

As pointed out by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that the relied upon portions of Cunningham teach judging whether communication between domains are permitted or not based on whether a response from DNS is received. And Cunningham does not disclose an inter-domain communication definition module, communicability field and translation rule as recited in claim 1, as amended.

With respect to the cited reference Squire (US 7,139,838), it is submitted that it teaches providing policy based inter-domain distribution of messages. However, Squire does not teach an inter-domain communicability field which is held in said inter-domain communication definition module and defined for each combination of source domain identifier and destination domain identifier or a translation rule which is held in said inter-domain communication definition module.

Thus it is submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of Cunningham and is allowable. Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable therewith.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan Weber/
Nathan Weber
Reg. No. 50,958

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8564
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Attorney Docket No.: FUJY 18.546 (100794-11681)